

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action, Claims 1 and 14 are amended. Claims 1-21 remain in the Application. Reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oshima et al. (“Oshima”), U.S. Patent No. 6,574,423 in view of Chai et al. (“Chai”), U.S. Patent No. 6,553,147.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the relied upon references must teach or suggest every limitation of the claim such that the invention as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to one skilled in the art.

Among other elements, amended Claim 1 recites:

“a compressor for processing input stereoscopic/multiview three-dimensional video data ..., and multiplexing the multi-channel elementary streams into a single integrated elementary stream, wherein the multiplexing is performed according to one of user-selected display modes that include a field-based shuttering display mode and a frame-based shuttering display mode, the single integrated elementary stream for the field-based shuttering display mode being a fractional portion of the single integrated elementary stream for the frame-based shuttering display mode” (emphasis added).

Oshima does not disclose multiplexing input data to generate a single stream, wherein the single stream for a first mode is a fractional portion of the single stream for a second mode. FIGs. 20-26 of Oshima describe different embodiments of a video recording and reproduction system. However, Oshima does not teach or suggest generating a single stream having the recited features. Rather, Oshima discloses the generation of either multiple output streams (e.g., FIGs. 24-25) or a single stream having only one mode (e.g., FIG. 23). Thus, Oshima does not disclose each of the elements of amended Claim 1.

Chai does not cure the defects of Oshima. Chai is relied on for disclosing packetized video and audio. However, Chai does not disclose multiplexing input data to generate a single

stream, wherein the single stream for a first mode is a fractional portion of the single stream for a second mode. Thus, Oshima in view of Chai does not teach or suggest each of the elements of amended Claim 1.

Analogous discussions apply to independent Claim 14, which is amended to include similar limitations. Claims 2-7, 12, 13, 15 and 20-21 depend from Claims 1 and 14, respectively, and incorporate the limitations thereof. Thus, for at least the reasons mentioned above in regard to Claims 1 and 14, these dependent claims are non-obvious over the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of Claims 1-21 are requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge those fees to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: June 29, 2007

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(310) 207-3800



Eric S. Hyman, Reg. No. 30,139

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted
electronically via EFS Web on the date shown below



Marilyn Bass June 29, 2007